



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,566	03/11/2004	Manish K. Deliwala	60655.8900	2565
66170	7590	11/15/2010	EXAMINER	
Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. (AMEX) ONE ARIZONA CENTER 400 E. VAN BUREN STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202				OBEID, FAHD A
3627		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			11/15/2010	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

HSOBELMAN@SWLAW.COM
DMIER@SWLAW.COM
JESLICK@SWLAW.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/708,566	DELIWALA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	FAHD A. OBEID	3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11 and 13-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-11, and 13-22 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. This is in reply to communication filed on 08/24/2010.
2. No claims have been added.
3. Claims 5 and 12 remain cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 3, 7, 10, 11, and 21-22 have been amended.
5. Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-22 are currently pending and have been examined.

Specification Objections

6. The amendment filed 08/24/2010 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: “determining, by the computer based system, optimal technology usage of the internal structure within the entity based on the allocating and the value drive data”.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 1, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The applicant's amendment filed on 08/24/2010 contains the limitation "determining, by the computer based system, optimal technology usage of the internal structure within the entity based on the allocating and the value drive data" is considered new matter since it does not have any support in the specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacFarlane (US 6,125,354) in view of Peterson (US 7,020,628).

12. Regarding Claim 1: MacFarlane discloses a method comprising:

- receiving, by a computer based system for allocating billing, data corresponding to usage of a technology resource by a group within an internal structure within an entity, wherein the group is assigned a distinct group identifier (*fig.1 reference characters 108-122*), wherein a business model file of the entity comprises internal structure information including a list of a plurality of groups within the entity, and wherein the group is part of the plurality of groups (col 1 lns 27-42, col 2 lns 58-67, col 3 lns 20-26, col 3 lns 54-63);
- receiving, by the computer based system, value driver data (*re-price parameters/miscellaneous charge*) associated with the group, wherein the value driver data is the criteria used by the entity to determine if the entity is successful (figs.1,4,&5; col 6 lns 57-64);
- receiving, by the computer based system, raw billing data associated with the technology resource (fig.1, col 2 lns 1-3, col 5 lns 1-5);

MacFarlane does not explicitly disclose that a usage is assigned a unique task identifier; receiving descriptive data corresponding to the unique task identifier; allocating the raw billing data based on usage; and determining an optimal usage of the internal structure based on the allocating and the value drive data.

However, Peterson does teach a service bureau storing the starting and ending time stamps in a memory, wherein the starting and ending time stamps are associated in a user log

Art Unit: 3627

with a list of authorized users, so that the user log contains a record of computer time usage for each authorized user (col 4 lns 5-10).

Peterson teaches a user log “unique task identifier” for use by a billing computer to generate bills (abstract). Maintaining a list of host computer networks and associated list of authorized users for each network, creating a starting and ending time stamp for remote access calls, transmitting the starting and ending time stamps in the user log to a billing computer in addition to other billing information, and generating a billing summary of costs and usage at the billing computer (col 5 lns 18-24)

Peterson teaches a bill may be generated that breaks up authorized users into various departments to which they are assigned within an organization. For each authorized user in the department a predetermined group of information may be displayed. The information may include the cost of long distance telephone usage which is distributed among authorized users based on the amount of time a user was communicating with the host computer network (col 4 lns 50-60). Furthermore, Peterson teaches a billing computer may generate monthly reports dividing up the usage for each individual authorized user by total time used per a given period or by time of day or week so that host computer network or service bureau resources can be properly allocated for particularly heavy usage (col 5 lns 10-15). see also (col 4 lns 35-42).

Furthermore, Peterson teaches monitoring the costs of remote users accessing the host computer or computer network of the company, in addition to tracking the usage of computer time and various costs associated with that time. each organization's computer facility tracks computer usage internally and generates various reports based on that information. (col 1 lns 27-33).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Peterson's teachings in MacFarlane's "system and method for generating an invoice charges to the elements of an organization" enabled, for the advantage of monitoring the costs of remote users accessing the host computer or computer network of the company, in addition to tracking the usage of computer time and various costs associated with that time (Peterson; col 1 lns 27-30).

13. Regarding Claim 2: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the technology resource includes at least one of, telephony resource usage, manufacturing cycles, production runs, and computer usage, wherein the computer usage includes computing time obtained from an outsourced provider (col 6 lns 15-20 and col 8 lns 55-58).

14. Regarding Claim 3: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further including reporting, by the computer based system, a business performance indicator, wherein the business performance indicator is based on the value driver data and the raw billing data (figs 1-4, col 1 lns 27-42, and col 3 lns 54-63).

15. Regarding Claim 4: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further including automatically recognizing, by the computer based system, at least one of the distinct group identifier and the unique task identifier (figs. 2-4 and col 8 lns 26-34).

16. Regarding Claim 6: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 4, wherein the allocating further includes allocating, by the computer based system, loyalty points to the entity (figs. 2-4

Art Unit: 3627

and col 8 lns 26-34).

17. Regarding Claim 7: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the allocating further includes reducing, by the computer based system, the allocated billing by a monetary value of loyalty points (figs. 2-4 and col 8 lns 26-34).

18. Regarding Claim 8: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the allocating further includes at least one of transferring, pooling and gifting loyalty points (figs. 2-4 and col 8 lns 26-28).

19. Regarding Claim 9: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further including providing, by the computer based system, a descriptive billing statement including the unique task identifier and the distinct group identifier (fig. 1, col 4 lns 45-48, and col 7 lns 10-14).

20. Regarding Claim 11: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, further including adjusting, by the computer based system, the allocated billing based upon at least one of a CPU-second used, a total CPU-seconds expected to be used, a volume discount, a stepped-type of pricing, a peak/off-peak usage, a geographic location, a service provided, a performance expectation, a location, a service level scoring, a CPU cycle, a local power consumption cost, a physical site security, an increased site security, an additional operational procedure needed to support increased sensitive data, a level of fail over needed, a service level agreement, and an

account data privacy requirement (figs 2-4, abstract, and claim 1).

21. Regarding Claim 17: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 13, further including performing data analysis of said computer usage using the at least one application performance driver (fig.1, col 5 lns 1-12, and claim 4).

22. Regarding Claim 18: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 13, further including suggesting a cost efficient usage practice (col 1 lns 42-46 and col 1 lns 61-65).

23. Regarding Claim 19: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 13, further including requesting a bid based upon said monitoring step (col 3 lns 31-40).

24. Regarding Claim 20: MacFarlane discloses a method of claim 1, wherein said business model file further includes at least one of an application profile, a value driver, a user level, a geographic area, a project, a zone, a third party provider, loyalty information and a rule (col 3 lns 31-40 and col 4 lns 1-8).

25. Regarding Claims 10 and 13-16: MacFarlane does not explicitly disclose a computer usage includes computing time obtained from an outsourced provider, monitoring computer usage, and notifying at least one user of said computer usage.

However, Peterson does discloses a method of claim 1 wherein said technology resources includes at least one of computer usage, wherein said computer usage includes computing time

obtained from an outsourced provider, telephony resource usage, manufacturing cycles and production runs (col 1 lns 17-18 and col 4 lns 7-10); Monitoring said computer usage (col 1 lns 46-50); notifying the at least one user of said computer usage (col 5 lns 10-15).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Peterson's teachings in MacFarlane's "system and method for generating an invoice charges to the elements of an organization" enabled, for the advantage of monitoring the costs of remote users accessing the computer of the company (Peterson; col 1 lns 27-29).

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular the applicant argues that: a) receiving, by the computer based system, value driver data (*re-price parameters/miscellaneous charge*) associated with the group, wherein the value driver data is the criteria used by the entity to determine if the entity is successful (figs.1,4,&5; col 6 lns 57-64); b) the unique identifiers do not identify the user of the technology resource; the usage is not assigned a unique task identifier; the descriptive data do not correspond to a unique task identifier.

In response to a) examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. MacFarlane teaches applying re-price parameters for a division within an organization (fig.1). Applying miscellaneous charges for a user (fig.5). The re-priced parameters are selected by the customer in connection with the

rebilling procedure. If the check box is filled or activated, then the billed charges are re-billed to the desired elements of the organization (col 4 lns 55-62) (also col 8 lns 25-34).

MacFarlane does not explicitly disclose that a usage is assigned a unique task identifier; receiving descriptive data corresponding to the unique task identifier; allocating the raw billing data based on usage.

In response to b) examiner respectfully disagrees. MacFarlane does not explicitly disclose that a usage is assigned a unique task identifier; receiving descriptive data corresponding to the unique task identifier; allocating the raw billing data based on usage. However, Peterson does teach a service bureau storing the starting and ending time stamps in a memory, wherein the starting and ending time stamps are associated in a user log with a list of authorized users, so that the user log contains a record of computer time usage for each authorized user (col 4 lns 5-10).

Peterson teaches a user log “unique task identifier” for use by a billing computer to generate bills (abstract). Maintaining a list of host computer networks and associated list of authorized users for each network, creating a starting and ending time stamp for remote access calls, transmitting the starting and ending time stamps in the user log to a billing computer in addition to other billing information, and generating a billing summary of costs and usage at the billing computer (col 5 lns 18-24)

Peterson teaches a bill may be generated that breaks up authorized users into various departments to which they are assigned within an organization. For each authorized user in the department a predetermined group of information may be displayed. The information may include the cost of long distance telephone usage which is distributed among authorized users based on the amount of time a user was communicating with the host computer network (col 4

lns 50-60). Furthermore, Peterson teaches a billing computer may generate monthly reports dividing up the usage for each individual authorized user by total time used per a given period or by time of day or week so that host computer network or service bureau resources can be properly allocated for particularly heavy usage (col 5 lns 10-15). see also (col 4 lns 35-42). Therefore, MacFarlane in view of Peterson still meets the scope of the limitation as currently claimed.

Conclusion

27. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAHD A. OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
November 7, 2010

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627